

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Kumar et al. Art Unit : 2171
Serial No. : 10/723,742 Examiner : Gregory J. Vaughn
Filed : November 26, 2003 Conf. No. : 9947
Title : COMMON MESSAGE AREA FOR A CUSTOMER INTERACTION CENTER
USER INTERFACE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEWS

Applicants' representative conducted interviews with Examiner Vaughn on March 21, 2007, and on April 18, 2007. This paper supplements Examiner Vaughn's summaries of the same, mailed March 26, 2007, and April 24, 2007, respectively.

In the March 21, 2007, interview, Applicants' representative pointed out that the Examiner did not address certain aspects of claim 25 in the final Office Action mailed December 27, 2006. In particular, the Examiner did not address receiving input associated with the common message area and pausing the automatic scrolling upon receiving the input. Moreover, although this aspect was addressed in the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 6 and 18, Applicants' representative traversed the rejections of claims 6 and 18, because the Examiner relied on a fourth reference, Corneille, that merely teaches a scrollable text box, but does not teach or suggest pausing automatic scrolling as recited in claims 6, 18 and 25.

In the telephone interview of March 21, 2007, the Examiner acknowledged that the final rejection mailed December 27, 2006, and the Advisory Action mailed March 2, 2007, did not fully address these aspects and agreed to review the case and issue a Supplemental Advisory Action, as noted in the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed March 26, 2007.

In a Supplemental Advisory Action mailed March 28, 2007, the Examiner advised that "Wahr discloses . . . a scrolling text message that was created by the interactive center and can be stopped (i.e., paused)." In a telephone interview of April 18, 2007, Applicants' representative pointed out that aspects of claims 6, 18 and 25 still had not been addressed in either of the Advisory Actions mailed March 2, 2007, and March 28, 2007, nor had these aspects been previously addressed in the final Office Action mailed December 27, 2006. In particular, the

Examiner did not address "receiving input from a pointing device associated with the interaction center agent device, the input specifying a cursor location over the common message area, wherein the automatic scrolling action of the broadcast message is paused upon receiving input." Moreover, the combination of references relied upon by the Examiner does not at all suggest this feature.

As indicated in the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed April 24, 2007, the Examiner found the above-referenced arguments persuasive and "agreed to withdraw the finality of the previous action and reconsider the merits of the invention as a whole." Based on this agreement in the telephone interview of April 18, 2007, which was confirmed by the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed April 24, 2007, Applicants understand that the final Office Action mailed December 27, 2007, has been vacated; that a new Office Action will be forthcoming; and that no further response by Applicants is due at this time. If Applicants' understanding is incorrect, Applicants request further clarification in writing.

No fee is believed to be due. If necessary, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 26, 2007



Matthew J. Smyth
Reg. No. 58,224

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696